

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### *Double patenting*

The Examiner has rejected claims 20, 23-27, 30 and 31 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4 and 10-16 of U.S. Patent 6,728,279. Claims 21-34 are pending in the application. It is assumed that the Examiner is referring to claim 21, rather than claim 20. Nevertheless, Applicants are filing a terminal disclaimer herewith to overcome these rejections. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

It is noted that, while the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 20-33 are rejected, claims 21-34 are pending in the application and the above-noted double-patenting rejection is the only grounds for rejection set forth in the Office Action. Based on a conversation between Applicant's representative, Paul Churilla, and the Examiner's supervisor, Min Sun Harvey, it was concluded that claims 22, 28, 29 and 32-34 are allowable.


### *Conclusion*

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (360) 379-6514. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

**McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP**

Date: Nov. 3, 2005

By:   
Paul W. Churilla  
Reg. No. 47,495

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8**

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED ON AUGUST 11, 2005 is being deposited as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 3 day of November 2005.

  
Paul W. Churilla